DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 643 RE 003 214

TITLE	Utilization of Paraprofessional Personnel in Intensive Remedial Reading.
INSTITUTION	Hammond School City, Ind.
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	104p.; End of project report
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Grade 6, Grade 7, Grade 8, Inservice Education, Instructional Materials, *Middle Schools, *Paraprofessional School Personnel, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, *Reading Research, *Remedial Reading Programs

ABSTRACT

An ESEA/Title III program designed to expand services to remedial readers through the use of paraprofessional personnel is described. The greater part of the report explains the need for such a program, selection and training of paraprofessionals, materials, project implementation, parental involvement, and inservice training of the professional staff. In the preservice training of 24 paraprofessionals, attention was given to psychology in dealing with underachieving adolescents, rapport in professional relaticnships, ethics, audiovisual aids, motivational techniques, and practical experience. Certificated teachers made the professional decisions of disability diagnosis, material selection, and formulation of instructional objectives; paraprofessionals carried out the plans of the professionals. The remainder of the report deals with (1) subjective program evaluation through the use of questionnaires to program participants, principals, content-area teachers, and parents and (2) objective evaluation of 832 pupils in grades 6, 7, and 8, who received remedial instruction during the 3 years of the project, and 197 control pupils. The reading growth of children receiving instruction through paraprofessional services led to the conclusion that such a staff can make a significant contribution to the remedial instruction of middle-school pupils. Tables and appendixes are included. (DH)

ED046643

UTILIZATION OF PARAPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

IN

INTENSIVE REMEDIAL READING

Title III

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

End of Project Report

August, 1970

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Eleanor P. Dragus, Project Director

The School City of Hammond, Indiana

RE003 214

ED046643

INTRODUCTION

This corrective reading program was operational in the middle schools in the School City of Hammond, Indiana, from July 1, 1967 through August 31, 1970. The population of Hammond is approximately 120,000 with a pupil population during the school year 1968 - 1969 of 23,584. Enrollment in middle schools, grades six, seven, and eight is 5,063 of which in excess of 600 pupils are identified each year as having reading disabilities.

A summer corrective reading program has been available to pupils from both public and parochial schools since 1963, but during an eight week summer program, little lasting reading growth may be expected. A corrective reading program is existent during the school year, but due to limited number of staff members, only an approximate number of 200 pupils may receive corrective reading aid as a part of the curriculum. These pupils are selected from grades four through eight, so in actuality fewer than 150 pupils from the middle schools participate in the corrective reading program provided by certificated staff members.

The Hammond Public School System is committed to the concept of a middle school program, grades six, seven and eight. The transition from the 8-4 plan and the 6-6 plan is gradually taking place as existing buildings are being reorganized and new construction of middle schools is being completed. In general, the philosophy of the corrective reading program has been to provide intensive help to pupils preparing to enter high school in an effort to better prepare them for extensive content area study. The emphasis of middle school corrective aid rather than primary and intermediate preventive and developmental instruction may be questioned by some reading specialists, but we have found pupil growth and subsequent accomplishment rewarding at these grade levels.

Recognizing the numbers of pupils requiring aid in the middle schools and our lack of staff available to provide the services required, another solution was sought. One possible solution was a better utilization of the skills and knowledge of our certified staff. In order to determine the advisability of the move we were considering, a certain amount of experimentation and evaluation was deemed necessary. The Title III ESEA funds were available and after application to the federal government, some $170,000 was granted to us for a two year study in the use of paraprofessional personnel in intensive corrective reading instruction. Upon further application, a third year of funding was granted.

PROJECT PROPOSAL - THE NEED

This remedial reading project was directed to middle school pupils who required extensive reading improvement in order to utilize their talents in the classroom. In the typical middle school program each pupil has a variety of teachers or, at best, several teachers who teach him combinations of classes for blocks of time. In any case, most pupils have lost the supporting and individual attention that is typically supplied by the self-contained classroom.

This adjustment is significantly more difficult for pupils who have problems in reading and who cannot go to the content area teacher and receive assistance with vocabulary, word analysis, and the techniques of reading that he really requires. Each teacher is responsible for the instruction of so many pupils and meets the classes for such a relatively short period of time that she is unable to provide the kind of assistance, particularly in specialized areas, that can be obtained in the self-contained classroom. In addition, reading skills are not developed by content area teachers except insofar as they are inherent in the subject matter material. Even if the teacher had a schedule providing time for individual assistance and instruction, studies have indicated that high school and junior high school teachers have little in the way of preparation or competencies in the teaching of basic or corrective reading.

Previous experience with pilot studies and summer corrective reading classes have indicated a badly needed corrective reading program in the middle school of Hammond, Indiana. Over six hundred pupils from the middle school grades are identified each spring as needing considerable remedial help. Corrective reading classes are provided during the summer to provide at least a modicum of individual instruction, but pupils cannot be required to attend these classes. Experience has shown that such remediation is helpful, but the summer session is so short, the numbers of pupils who can be reached so few, and the possibility of follow-up the subsequent school year so remote, that the scope of a summer program is limited. Studies indicate that remedial instruction does in fact produce permanent changes in children's reading competence providing they are not too severely handicapped. Indications are that there is considerable improvement in the child's performance in the content areas as a result of remedial reading instruction. In addition, sustained but less intensive help appears to maintain the child's performance once he reaches a better level of functioning.

Ideally, individual or small group instruction in remedial reading would be provided by reading teachers with specialized skills in this technical area. As many studies indicate, the ability of our society to train sufficient technical personnel in specialized areas will never approach the demand for such services and that extension through group techniques and para-

professional personnel is a necessity. This is particularly true as population increases outstrip school construction and the resultant large class size eventuate in more reading difficulties.

PROJECT PROPOSAL - A SOLUTION

The School City of Hammond, Indiana, proposed to attack these problems by the development of a program which would train and employ paraprofessional reading technicians, provide in-service training in reading skill development to content area teachers, and involve parents of remedial reading pupils in the pupil's reading problems. The program was directed and supervised by specialists in the area of reading who were thus able to extend their knowledge, skill and ability to reach the needs of many rather than a few and thereby upgrade the total reading program of the school city.

Paraprofessional personnel were trained to offer remedial reading instruction to the middle school pupils of public and private schools of the city. The instruction was highly individualized and relatively intensive. The professional decisions of disability diagnosis, material selection, instructional objectives, evaluation procedures and parent communication remained in the hands of the certificated reading teacher. The paraprofessional reading technician carried out the plans of the professional.

A research design was devised to enable the professional staff to evaluate outcomes and determine future activities to improve reading skill development at the middle school level.

As can be seen, the goal of the entire program was to reach

more children for longer periods of time and to extend the skills of professional personnel via more easily obtained personnel, to directly assist the child with reading difficulties.

PROJECT PROPOSAL - INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

This remedial reading project was innovative in several dimensions.

I. The use of a carefully planned training program to teach paraprofessional personnel to perform a much needed technical skill. Remedial reading is a highly complex topic and typically paraprofessional persons are not thought of as being capable of performing in such an area.

II. The extension of the skill of highly trained personnel to application with hundreds rather than dozens of disabled readers. A major way of doing this is by using such specialists as teachers and supervisors of less highly trained persons, so that many of the specific and easily communicated skills can be passed on to the pupils.

III. The involvement of the child's family in his reading problems may increase their supportive help to augment the child's motivation to change. Direct education to such parents is possible. We can help them become more knowledgeable about selecting materials and books for their children.

IV. The use of experimental procedures in an on-going study of children in typical public school situations. Usually such studies are done without proper evaluation,

selection, or statistical procedures with the result that their outcomes are of dubious value.

SELECTION FOR THE TRAINING PROGRAM

The single most important factor in the success of a program utilizing non-professionals in instructional roles is that of selection. As yet no instrument has been devised which can predict teaching success in the classroom; therefore, all judgements in personnel selection tend to be somewhat subjective. Both the application form and the personal interview should be structured in such a way as to determine the background of the candidate and his potential for growth.

The application form designed to screen individuals for personal interviews for this program included sections dealing with:

I. Educational Preparation
   - A. Academic (H.S. Diploma required)
   - B. Special training

II. Community Involvement
   - A. Positions of leadership
   - B. Activities

III. Work Experience

IV. References

Each applicant was instructed to write an essay regarding his interest in being trained as a paraprofessional reading technician.

The personal interview provided an opportunity to observe personal characteristics and explore candidate motivation.

I. Personal Characteristics
   - A. Appearance

B. Dress

C. English usage

D. Voice effectiveness

E. Mental alertness

F. Enthusiam

G. Vitality

II. Experiences of value to the program

A. School activities

B. Community activities

C. Extracurricular activities

D. Additional (general)

The applicants who were chosen to participate in the training program were felt to possess the personal qualities and breadth of background upon which further training could be structured in order to develop the skills and ability necessary to providing instruction to remedial reading pupils.

A brief description of the individuals ultimately selected for the training program would be appropriate at this time. Ten of the paraprofessionals had graduated from high school and twelve had some college course work. All twenty-two had some experience in working with children such as, scout leader, Sunday school teacher, or substitute teacher. One of the paraprofes-sionals had taught school for four years when only two years of college were required for certification. Few of the paraprofes-sionals had been employed in any other wage earning occupation.

All were what one would consider civic-minded and had been involved in numerous volunteer service organizations. Nearly one-half of those accepted as paraprofessionals had a child who had experienced difficulty in academic achievement in school at some time. They wanted to be involved in a program which would benefit this type of pupil. Only one of the paraprofessionals was unmarried, and she was following a course of teacher preparation at one of the local universities.

Our standards for selection were high, but in order to assure success of the project, we felt no compromise could be made. We trained twenty-four paraprofessionals but employed only the twenty who most competently completed the training program. Of the four remaining, two have been utilized as substitutes in the project and have participated in additional training programs.

THE PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

In determining the content of the training program, consideration was given to the following areas of instruction:

PSYCHOLOGY The paraprofessional staff was to be working with underachieving adolescents. Both an adolescent and an underachiever possess traits which demand an understanding and skill of motivation not required by other grade levels or other pupils.

RAPPORT Any non-certified staff member needs to be cognizant of teacher-pupil relationships, teacher-teacher relationships, and teacher-parent relationships. Although we were not proposing that paraprofessionals assume the same role as teacher, it was felt that in order to perceive their own relationship to the professional staff, a realistic understanding needed to be developed.

ETHICS The non-professional was provided with information regarding the legal and ethical implications of her postion in the classroom, and the concept of professional behaviour was emphasized. School city policy and individual building policies were thoroughly investigated and discussed.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS The paraprofessionals were provided instruction in the use of audio-visual equipment as well as a study of audio-visual materials available for use in the

corrective reading area. Emphasis was placed on the use of equipment designed specifically for improvement of reading skills.

MOTIVATION Methods and techniques of motivation of pleasure reading were emphasized extensively throughout the training program. As a central theme of the Hammond corrective reading program is a belief that if one has a desire or personal need to read, he will read and will consequently improve his reading skills.

SEQUENTIAL READING SKILLS Paraprofessionals were to be reteaching skills to pupils who had displayed weakness in specific areas, therefore, much time was spent in work with methods, techniques, and materials designed to give corrective aid to pupils.

PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE Forty hours were spent by the paraprofessionals in the classrooms of the summer corrective reading program, during which time they:

I. Observed teachers
II. Prepared lesson plans
III. Studied materials
IV. Worked with small groups

In evaluating the training program, the paraprofessionals felt this experience was the most valuable portion of their preparation. The staff providing instruction for the training program was obtained solely from the Hammond Public

School System. In as much as we wanted the Title III project to parallel the corrective reading program already operative in the schools and to be consistent with the philosophy and policies of Hammond, we felt this utilization of our own staff to be imperative.

Following is a list of the personnel who provided guidance and instruction throughout the training program:

Assistant Superintendent - Curriculum and Instruction

Director of Psychological Services

Director of Attendance and Welfare

Director of Special Education

Coordinator of Language Arts and Reading

Assistant Director of Elementary Education

Director of Summer Corrective Reading Program

Director of Title III - Paraprofessional Reading

Principal, secondary

Principal, elementary

Language Arts teachers (2)

Corrective Reading teachers (5)

The major goal of the pre-service training session was to provide paraprofessional personnel with the ability to provide remedial reading instruction under close professional supervision in certain specialized areas.

THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

During the first two operational years of the project weekly two-hour in-service training programs for the paraprofessionals were held. Implementation of the project determined to a great extent the content of these training sessions as unforeseen circumstances were encountered.

The original project proposal included tutorial assistance in content areas as well as remedial reading skill instruction. The pre-service training had consisted of a study of general education and specifics in the technology of reading skill instruction; consequently, during the first year of operation most of the in-service training program workshops were devoted to instruction in the development of study skills in various content areas. In as much as possible pupils were scheduled into the experimental groups from language arts and social studies classes, so there was concentration on the development of study skills in these content areas. The language arts and social studies coordinators as well as master teachers in the language arts and social studies areas provided instruction for the paraprofessionals. The Director of Homebound services, who has had a great deal of experience in tutoring individuals and small groups also assisted the paraprofessionals in developing techniques of tutorial instruction.

Throughout the first two operative years much time in the in-

service training program was devoted to:

1. Pupil motivation
2. Teacher record keeping
3. Reporting procedures
4. Material familiarization

One of the most time-consuming, yet beneficial projects carried on during in-service was that of the compilation of a booklet containing a complete cross-referencing of all materials available in the corrective reading program. Reference to this booklet provided staff members with a complete listing of materials available for instruction and remediation of specific skill disabilities.

During operation of the project, both the paraprofessional reading technician and the reading supervisors suggested topics for in-service training sessions. Many of these dealt with techniques and methods to be employed in specific reading skill development. In all cases an attempt was made to obtain the best consultants available in these specialized areas. Classroom teachers, reading specialists, and administrative staff were employed in paraprofessional training sessions.

Most fortunately at this time "The Northwest Multi-Service Center", an ESEA Title III project, was operational out of Valparaiso, Indiana. One of the primary responsibilities of this center was to provide consultation and in-service training to

cooperating agencies, one of which was the School City of Hammond. A series of six two-hour sessions of in-service was provided by the Multi-Service Center with an emphasis on content area reading skills and comprehension skill development through use of the "Directed Reading Activity".

During the third year of operation, the paraprofessional reading technicians participated in four certificated reading teacher in-service programs. Additional in-service training was provided by each reading supervisor in the individual buildings to which paraprofessional reading technicians were assigned.

In a survey conducted at the conclusion of the three year project, there was a general request that in-service training solely for the paraprofessional staff be reinstituted on a monthly basis.

PUPIL SELECTION

Each spring the teachers of pupils grades two through seven refer pupils for the summer corrective reading program. Included on these referral forms are all available test data as well as the teacher's assessment of independent, instructional, and frustration reading levels. An indication of emotional and physical deterrants to academic achievement is also given. School attendance and classroom discipline problems are given consideration. The criteria for teacher referral include:

I. Intelligence Quotient of 90 or above on an individual intelligence test.

II. Intelligence Quotient of 85 or above on a group intelligence test.

III. A reading level at least one year below grade placement on a standardized test instrument.

It was from these referrals that our original pool of possible project participants was obtained. Only referral forms for those pupils never having received corrective reading assistance in a small instructional group were considered. Those schools lacking sufficient numbers for our control and experimental groups were recontacted and additional referrals were obtained through the assistance of the counseling staff and the reading supervisors.

A major modification during the third year of project operation was the elimination of a minimum I.Q. for participation.

This modification was recommended by the State of Indiana On-Site Evaluation Team after a conference with building principals indicated vast numbers of pupils who needed individual reading instruction but did not qualify for existing programs through the special education department or the corrective reading department.

Special education would not accept pupils with an I.Q. over 79 and corrective reading preferred pupils with no lower than an I.Q. of 85. In actuality pupils with higher I.Q.'s have been given more consideration for corrective reading programs during the summer, because it was felt these pupils had the potential to make greater gains in a shorter period of time. When limited services are available to pupils, compromises of this nature are inevitable. This project, however, could fill an instructional void as well as ascertain statistically the value of providing reading instruction to lower I.Q. pupils.

The intelligence quotient range for this project was from 75 to 126. Pupils were disabled in reading from one to five years below grade level placement.

TESTING PROCEDURES

Each participant in this remedial reading project was pre-tested when he entered the program with three standardized instruments:

1. The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children
2. The Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs
3. The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Achievement Test Level II

At the conclusion of the pupil's participation, he was retested with different forms of the Gray Oral and the Stanford Diagnostic. Growth scores were recorded for both experimental and control group subjects.

On the basis of the Gray Oral Paragraphs and the Stanford Diagnostic pre-test, as well as teacher made diagnostic reading instruments, the supervising reading teacher prescribed appropriate materials and techniques of instruction for each pupil. As pupil progress in certain areas was ascertained, revision of material selection and instructional emphasis was re-evaluated by the professional reading teacher. Additional diagnosis and prescription was an ongoing process throughout the three year duration of this program.

The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Achievement Test was particularly valuable to the reading teacher because it contained subtests relating to the reading skill areas of:

Comprehension — Literal

Comprehension -- Inferential

Syllabication

Sound Discrimination

Blending

Rate of Reading

In addition to the stanine scores on these subtests the frustrational grade equivalent reading level is also obtainable.

It was generally felt by the reading teachers that the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs were better used as a diagnostic instrument rather than an indicator of pupil reading achievement.

MATERIALS

The selection of materials purchased for the Paraprofessional Reading Program took into consideration the age levels of the participants as well as the reading disabilities which would be encountered. Experienced teachers of remedial reading to sixth, seventh and eighth grade pupils were consulted, and their recommendations were incorporated into the final material order.

Pleasure reading books comprised the major expenditure of ESEA Title III funds for materials. The interest levels of these books ranged from sixth to eighth grade, but the readability levels extended from second grade through eighth grade. In addition to these purchased books, the Hammond Public Library supplied us with additional numbers of high interest-low reading level pleasure books to equip each reading center with a well-rounded classroom library. Pupils were also encouraged to avail themselves of the services of the building resource center, the public library, and paperback book clubs.

Skill building non-consumable workbooks were supplied in sufficient numbers and instructional levels to meet the needs of each pupil. Timed reading comprehension exercises, longer comprehension practice, vocabulary development, and phonics skills materials were included. Although selected materials were purchased solely for this project, the Corrective Reading Resource Center provided an additional variety of published materials.

Games designed to teach basic sight words, sound discrimination, and syllabication were also purchased for this program. These were employed as a supplement to the basic instruction.

Each paraprofessional reading technician was supplied with professional books for reference, the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction publications concerning developmental reading and remedial reading, and the school city publication, The Hammond Guide to Remedial Reading.

Uniform pupil answer sheets were provided for all materials inorder that workbooks might be used as non-consumable items. Teacher answer keys were combined into a workable handbook to provide facility in checking pupil classwork. A master sheet recording all materials used for individual pupil instruction was kept in the pupil's reading folder. This master sheet enabled teachers and pupils to note progress in the various areas of skill development.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

One of the objectives of this project was to involve parents in the child's reading problems. An attenpt was made to have personal contact with each child's parents at least four times during his participation in the experimental project. In all cases a professional staff member was in charge of the conference with the paraprofessional technician involved, but in no way serving as spokesman for the program or the school.

Initial contact with parents was made at the beginning of each school year at which time the objectives of the project and the involvement of the pupils were explained. Many parents were threatened by the child's participation in the program because they professed no prior knowledge of the child's academic weakness. Others were concerned that the child might be mentally retarded. During this first parent conference an attempt was made to allay these fears through factual explanation regarding the criteria for pupil selection which demanded average or above average intelligence with reading achievement at least one year below the pupil's grade placement.

Following the first written report to parents which was an indication of the reading disabilities diagnosed through the use of standardized instruments and teacher-made devices, individual conferences were held with parents to explain thoroughly the pupil's weakness within specific reading skill areas. At this time recommendations were made regarding assistance which the parents

could provide at home.

A city-wide workshop for parents of children with reading disabilities was conducted. This workshop had several purposes:

> To involve parents in the improvement of the pupil's reading skills.
>
> To give parents an insight into the characteristics of an under-achieving adolescent.
>
> To help parents adopt a realistic attitude toward academic expectations for the pupil with a reading disability.
>
> To provide specific suggestions for home assistance in the improvement of reading skills.

The design of this workshop involved an outside consultant who served as main speaker and set the tone for the session, followed by small study groups which parents selected on the basis of interest and a feelin of need for guidance. The professional staff from the School City of Hammond as well as reading specialists from nearby communities served as discussion leaders for the small group sessions.

Accompanyin each written report of pupil progress as a conference request form which was returned to the reading supervisor requesting a personal call, a personal interview, or indicating no need for contact at that time.

Parent conferences were also held at the request of the paraprofessional technician. In each of these conferences the certificated staff member served as spokesman for the project with a paraprofessional servin as the background advisor regarding

specific behavior and learning patterns of the pupil in the classroom. Although some conferences were called due to disciplinary breakdown, most were arranged to discuss pupil growth in reading.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

September, 1967 - June, 1968

The original project proposal contained an experimental design which provided data for the following experimental sub-groups in each of the grades six, seven, and eight:

100 pupils	one semester	three days per week
100 pupils	one semester	five days per week
50 pupils	two semesters	three days per week
50 pupils	two semesters	five days per week

The daily instruction by paraprofessional staff was to include:

30 minutes of remedial reading instruction
time interval
30 minutes of content area tutoring

Each paraprofessional reading technician was assigned ten pupils per day. (Five one semester pupils and five two semester pupils--one group meeting three days per week with the other meeting five days per week.)

The paraprofessional's weekly work schedule consisted of:

eight hours of pupil instruction
five hours of conference and preparation
two hours of in-service training

Twenty paraprofessionals were employed to work a total of fifteen hours per week @ $2.00 per hour.

The professional staff was to be comprised of a project director with three reading supervisors.

A major problem encountered during the first operational year was that of pupil scheduling. Middle school departmentalized classes in most buildings were forty-five minutes in length

meeting five times per week. Following the program as outlined in the proposal, pupils were scheduled out of at least two/thirds of two separate academic classes. Teachers of these classes could not evaluate pupil performance when the child might be present in class only fifteen minutes per day or at best two full class periods per week.

An unrealistic approach to assisting pupils with reading problems was employed in asking paraprofessional reading technicians to serve as tutors in <u>all</u> content areas. The primary objective of the project was to evaluate the use of paraprofessionals in the teaching of reading skills. To assign them to tutor in all content areas as well, we were asking more of them than we would of highly trained content area professionals.

Professional staffing presented an obstacle which was not easily overcome. During the first semester of operation, the project director was the only certificated staff member supervising twenty paraprofessionals who were providing reading instruction to 200 pupils. One experienced reading specialist was obtained for the second semester. Now more than ever we were confronted with the dearth of remedial reading professionals. Language arts teachers were pressed into service to supervise paraprofessional reading technicians. This was not a highly successful measure because of their own limited background in the complexities of reading skill development.

Despite the scheduling, tutoring and staffing difficulties, reading growth was reported exceeding that which was anticipated.

September, 1968 - June, 1969

In submitting application for the second year of funding to the Title III ESEA office of the Federal Government, request was made to alter the scheduling and tutoring format of the project.

This request was granted and the program was more smoothly implemented with four hundred pupils receiving one semester of instruction five days per week. The classes conducted by paraprofessionals coincided in length with those of the academic classes. Content area tutoring was eliminated, but an emphasis was placed on developing reading skills in content areas.

Twenty paraprofessionals were assigned ten pupils per day (five in each of two groups), with the resultant work schedule:

seven and one/half hours of pupil instruction
five hours of conference and preparation
two and one/half hours of in-service training

This totaled fifteen hours per week @ $2.00 per hour.

Recruitment procedures were effective and the full professional staff of a director with three reading supervisors was employed during the 1968-1969 school year.

September, 1969 - June, 1970

In October of 1968, an On-Site visitation was made of this project in accordance with the Indiana State Plan of Title III ESEA. Among the recommendations made by the evaluation team were:

> "It is suggested that this program could be incorporated into the corrective reading program currently operational in the school system upon the termination of the funding period..."
>
> "...it is recommeded that thought be given to the immediate inclusion in the program of the lower I.Q. students who have remained with the classroom teacher."

Although initial funding for this project was to cover only a two year period, the Division of Innovative and Exemplary Education of the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction felt that subsequent findings would warrant an additional operative year in order to incorporate the 1968 recommendations.

An operating budget of $50,000.00 was approved for the 1969-1970 school year.

Ten paraprofessional reading technicians were employed to provide supervised reading instruction to some 150 pupils for two semesters five days per week. In the criteria for pupil selection, the minimum I.Q. requirement was eliminated.

To demonstate the feasibility of using paraprofessional reading technicians within the existent framework of the Hammond Public Schools Corrective Reading Program the following modifications in implementation were made:

I. Paraprofessionals were assigned to buildings where budgeted corrective reading specialists were to assume the total responsibility for the corrective reading program in that building.

II. In-service training plans were altered in order that paraprofessional staff could participate in the corrective reading department in-service programs with professional staff.

These two modifications served to remove the paraprofessional reading program from the isolated position of being a "federal" project with central office administration. It now was a program within a building where the administrative, counseling, and teaching staff could determine the direction of the program in terms of the needs of the pupils within that building. Instruction by paraprofessionals was more adequately supervised when the reading supervisor more clearly recognized himself as being totally responsible for the corrective reading program of that building. This feeling of responsibility prompted the reading specialist to provide more service in consultation with content area teachers. In three buildings the total reading program was revised and pilot classes were organized under the guidance of the building reading specialist.

During the third operative year, paraprofessionals worked with three groups of pupils (five per group) forty-five minutes per day. The resultant work schedule was:

Thirteen hours of pupil instruction
Seven hours of conference on preparation

Totaling twenty hours per week @ $2.00 per hour.

IN-SERVICE - PROFESSIONAL STAFF

An objective of this project was to involve content area teachers in a program of in-service to upgrade the total reading program of the school system.

Working through the Curriculum Department of the school system and in cooperation with content area co-ordinators, a series of in-service training programs were conducted. Reading specialists planned and presented workshops for:

Vocal music teachers
Foreign language teachers
Language arts teachers
Social studies teachers

In each workshop attention was given to decoding and study skills which could be developed effectively within the content areas represented.

In all buildings in which the paraprofessional program was operational, the reading supervisor met with the building staff both as a whole and in departmentalized groups to provide assistance and leadership where possible.

The general effect of this concentretion on staff involvement in reading skill development over a three year period has served to, if not make content area teachers better teachers of reading, at least to make them aware of the great needs of their pupils in this respect.

Teachers in all areas appear to be accepting more responsibility in providing skill development assistance to pupils with

reading disabilities. They are more realistic in setting academic objectives for these children.

EVALUATION - SUBJECTIVE

Both in an actual attempt to evaluate progress of the Paraprofessional Reading Program and to open lines of communication, frequent survey questionnaires were circulated among those who were either actively or passively involved with this ESEA Title III project.

Principals of buildings in which the program was operational were frequently contacted regarding implementation procedures and overall impact on the educational program which this project effected.

Content area teachers were asked to assess overt changes in behavior and learning patterns of the experimental group participants. They also reflected those modifications of implementation which they felt would be of benefit in their buildings.

Reading supervisors evaluated the effectiveness of each paraprofessional and also proposed additional in-service training programs. Through both informal and structured conferences, guidelines for pupil/paraprofessional scheduling and reporting procedures were continuously revised to more consistently meet the needs of individual pupils and fit into the curriculum format of individual buildings.

Parents of experimental group pupils were contacted regarding their feelings and those of their children toward the program. Feedback from parents gave an indication of the effectiveness of the parent involvement feature of this project.

Paraprofessional reading technicians were involved in evaluating their own progress and the progress of the program. They, better than anyone else, could assess their needs for further training in certain reading skills areas. Through in-service training reteaching of the paraprofessionals was achieved. Since we were new to the training of ancillary personnel, it was only through them that we could ascertain their security in the duties they were performing.

Since little involvement of staff was effected prior to implementation of the program, survey questionnaires provided invaluable information to the project director. These provided clues to reasons for problems of implementation and pointed out steps which could be taken to alleviate these problems.

EVALUATION - OBJECTIVE

For purposes of data analysis and interpretation the outside evaluation firm of Evaluation and Research Specialists, Inc. of West Lafayette, Indiana was employed. The recommendation to use an outside evaluator came from the On-Site visitation team of 1968.

Areas of investigation in this study included:

SEX: Achievement of males vs. females

GRADE LEVEL PLACEMENT: sixth grade, seventh grade, eighth grade.

SCHOOL: A total of seven schools were involved in this study at some time during its three year duration. They fell into three main categories--

Disadvantaged -- These schools all qualified for Title I Target Area funds

Partially Disadvantaged -- A portion of the pupil enrollment came to these middle schools from feeder elementary schools which qualified for Title I funds.

Middle Class -- These neighborhood middle schools and their feeder elementary schools at no time have qualified for Title I monies.

INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT: On the basis of the WISC scores obtained for each pupil from control and experimental groups three divisions were obtained--

I.Q. ranges below 95
I.Q. ranging from 96 - 105
I.Q. ranges above 106

EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS: These groups were scheduled for paraprofessional instruction in one of several ways--

one semester of instruction - three days per week
one semester of instruction - five days per week
two consecutive semesters of instruction- three days per week

two consecutive semesters of instruction -
five days per week
one semester of instruction - time interval of a
summer or a summer + one semester -- addi-
tional semester of instruction

CONTROL GROUPS: These pupils were held as control for either one semester or two consecutive semesters.

Post test scores from the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Tests were analyzed. This included grade equivalency reading achievement scores on both tests and stanine scores from the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Subtests of:

Comprehension	Syllabication	Blending
Vocabulary	Sound Discrimination	

A total of 832 pupils received remedial reading instruction from paraprofessionals during the three years duration of this project.

In a breakdown of the experimental groups one finds:

Grade Level	Boys	Girls	Total
Sixth Grade	148	102	250
Seventh Grade	206	129	335
Eighth Grade	162	85	247
	516	316	832

Schools	Boys	Girls	Total
Disadvantaged	132	90	222
Partially Disadvantaged	227	125	352
Middle Class	157	101	258
	516	316	832

Instructional Blocks	Boys	Girls	Total
One Semester	337	214	541
Two consecutive Semesters	147	85	232
Two Semesters w/time interval	32	17	49
	516	316	832

A total of 197 pupils were in control groups at some time during the three year study. In a breakdown of the Control Groups one finds:

Grade Level	Boys	Girls	Total
Sixth Grade	23	14	37
Seventh Grade	64	37	101
Eighth Grade	30	29	59
	117	80	197

Schools	Boys	Girls	Total
Disadvantaged	19	17	36
Partially Disadvantaged	61	29	90
Middle Class	37	34	71
	117	80	197

Time Block	Boys	Girls	Total
One Semester	56	32	88
Two Semesters	61	48	109
	117	80	197

FINDINGS

The analysis was performed in two phases. Phase I is a compilation of the results of the analysis performed by Evaluation and Research Specialists of West Lafayette, Indiana. All data were analyzed using a fixed-effects analysis of variance model. There were uneven numbers of cases in the analysis, but this problem was accounted for in the method of analysis. In the interest of simplification only significant differences are reported. Additional information may be obtained from the project director. Phase II is a comparison of pre and post test scores with average growth computed for various groups.

PhaseI

In general, no significant differences were found between post test results of the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs and other variables such as sex, I.Q., grade placement, or duration of instruction. In effect this verifies the judgment of the Hammond reading specialists that this instrument serves the purpose of reading disability diagnosis better than the acquisition of a grade equivalent score indicating reading achievement.

Definite trends were observed in relationships between sections of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Achievement Test and the variables of sex, I.Q., grade placement, and duration of instruction.

Table 1: Significant Differences Between the Sexes on Stanford Diagnostic Reading Achievement Subtests

Stanford Subtests	Sexes	Significant Differences Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Comprehension	Males > Females	.05	.01	.05
Vocabulary	Males > Females	.01	.001	.01
Syllabication	Females > Males	.05	N.S.	.05
Sound Discrimination	Females > Males	.05	N.S.	N.S.
Blending	Females > Males	.01	.01	.01

Post test scores were obtained at the conclusion of each instructional segment of the project. Analysis of these scores indicated that boys' performance was at a higher stanine level than girls' at all three grade levels on the comprehension and vocabulary sub-tests. The difference between the two was more significant at grade seven on both sub-tests.

Girls' performance was at a higher stanine level than boys' in both sixth and eighth grades on the syllabication sub-test at the .05 level of significance. Only sixth grade girls achieved significantly higher than boys in sound discrimination skills at the .05 level. A significant difference at the .01 level was found on the blending sub-test at all three grade levels with girls performing at a higher level than boys.

Conclusion: In areas of vocabulary development and comprehension boys appear to benefit more from a remedial instruction than girls.

Table 2: Significant Differences Relating Intelligence Quotients to Stanford Diagnostic Reading Achievement Subtests

Stanford Subtests	*Intelligence Quotients	Significant Differences Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Comprehension	High > Median > Low	.01	.01	.01
Vocabulary	High > Median > Low	.01	.01	.01
Syllabication	High > Median > Low	N.S.	N.S.	.05
Sound Discrimination	High > Median > Low	.05	.05	.05
Blending	High > Median > Low	N.S.	N.S.	.01

* Intelligence Quotients

High I.Q. = 106 or above
Median I.Q. = 96 - 105
Low I.Q. = 95 or below

A linear relationship with higher I.Q. pupils achieving better than median I.Q. pupils, and median I.Q. pupils achieving better than lower I.Q. pupils was found in the post-test scores obtained from pupils receiving remedial reading instruction from paraprofessional technicians. This relationship was consistent at all grade levels on the comprehension, vocabulary, and sound discrimination sub-tests. Only at the eighth grade level was this relationship noted for the syllabication and blending sub-tests.

Conclusion: To provide instruction in order to obtain the most growth in a shorter time, preference should be given to those pupils with higher I.Q.'s.

Table 3: Significant Differences among Experimental and Control Groups on Stanford Diagnostic Reading Achievement Subtests

Subtests	*Experimental - Control Groups	Significant Differences Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Somprehension:	Groups 1,2,3, > Groups 4,5	.05	N.S.	N.S.
	Group 2 > Groups 1,4,5,	N.S.	N.S.	.01
Vocabulary:	Group 2 > Groups 1,3,4,5,	N.S.	N.S.	.05
Syllabication:	Group 2 > Groups 1,3,4,5	N.S.	N.S.	.01
Sound Discrimination:	Groups 1,2>Group 3> Group 4,5	N.S.	.05	N.S.
Blending		N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

* Experimental - Control Groups

Group 1 - One Semester Experimental
Group 2 - Two Semester Experimental (Consecutive)
Group 3 - Two Semester Experimental (with time interval)
Group 4 - One Semester Control
Group 5 - Two Semester Control

Where significant differences were found among the experimental and the control groups, those pupils receiving remedial reading instruction for two consecutive semesters achieved higher post-test scores on four of the five sub-tests than experimental groups 1 and 3, and control groups 4 and 5. This observation was most consistent at the eighth grade level.

From the comprehension (sixth grade) and sound discrimination (seventh grade), subtest terminal measures, pupils receiving one semester of remedial reading instruction and those receiving two semesters of instruction with a time interval achieved higher scores than groups held in control for either one or two semesters.

Conclusion: Two consecutive semesters of instruction (group 2) was the only group which indicated higher achievement scores than both one semester or two semester controls (groups 4 and 5).

Pupils who were in experimental and control groups were administered pre and post tests using both the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Average growth was computed for these groups.

One Semester Pupils

Grade Level	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Comprehension	Average Growth
Grade 6	145 Experimental Subjects	+ 9 months
	19 Control Subjects	+ 4 months
Grade 7	235 Experimental Subjects	+ 9 months
	43 Control Subjects	+ 6 months
Grade 8	215 Experimental Subjects	+ 9 months
	26 Control Subjects	+ 10 months

Normal growth during a one semester instructional time block would be + 5 months on a standardized achievement test. All subjects in this project were reading at least one year below grade level at entry; therefore, their rates of growth were below the norm. With paraprofessional reading instruction the experimental subjects averaged a growth of + 9 months which was + 4 months above expectation at all three grade levels. The control subjects approached the normal growth of + 5 months in grades six and seven. Eighth grade control subjects surpassed the average growth of experimental subjects by + 1 month.

Two Semester Pupils

Grade Level	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Comprehension	Average Growth
Grade 6	96 Experimental Subjects	+ 14 months
	18 Control Subjects	+ 10 months
Grade 7	75 Experimental Subjects	+ 12 months
	58 Control Subjects	+ 7 months
Grade 8	61 Experimental Subjects	+ 18 months
	33 Control Subjects	+ 12 months

Normal growth during a two semester instructional time block would be + 10 months on a standardized achievement test. Prior to participation in this project all subjects were achieving growth at a rate below the norm.

Experimental Subjects surpassed normal growth at all three grade levels:

Grade 6 + 4 months

Grade 7 + 2 months

Grade 8 + 8 months

Control Subjects approximated normal growth at the sixth and eighth grade levels. Seventh grade control subjects did not attain the norm of + 10 months growth.

It should be noted that eighth grade control subjects achieved at a rate above norm for both one semester and two semester time blocks. The average I.Q. for these pupils was in the higher range of 106+. As was previously noted higher I.Q. subjects achieved better than median I.Q. subjects. It also should be noted that the eighth grade experimental pupils in the project for two semesters averaged growth + 8 months above normal expectation. One explanation for this growth could be an increased motivation of pupils ready to enter the high school program.

On the basis of the comparison of experimental and control subjects' average growth scores with the norm of expectation, it can be stated that paraprofessionals can be used effectively in providing remedial reading instruction at the middle school level.

Control subjects' achievement exceeded our expectations for both one semester and two semester time blocks. Possible explanations for this situation are:

1. Reading and English class sizes were reduced because experimental pupils were taken from these classes, thereby providing more opportunity for individualization of instruction for control group pupils.

2. With the in-service provided by Title III reading staff, a new awareness of the necessity of updating the middle school reading program became apparent. Language arts teachers and content area teachers began placing more emphasis on the teaching of skills indigenous to reading.
3. However negative it may be, the observation must be made that some teachers felt threatened by paraprofessionals in the classroom and were particularly concerned that the measures of control subjects were being made in order to determine the effectiveness of instruction by certificated personnel.

CONCLUSIONS

With careful controls regarding selection of personnel an intensive pre-service and in-service training program and adequate supervision, paraprofessional staff may be employed to advantage in providing remedial reading instruction to small groups of middle school pupils.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Application form for Paraprofessional Employment

Appendix B Interview form for Paraprofessional Employment

Appendix C Teachers' Referral Forms to Corrective Reading Program

Appendix D Parent Letter

Appendix E Job Description - Paraprofessional Reading Technicians

Appendix F Job Description - Reading Supervisors

Appendix G Pre-Service Workshop

Appendix H Disability Diagnosis

Appendix I Evaluation Form - Teachers

Appendix J Evaluation Forms - Paraprofessionals

Appendix K Evaluation Form - Parents

Appendix L Parent Workshop

Appendix M Directive Reading Lesson

Appendix N Progress Reports

Appendix O Materials

Appendix P Sample of Report Sent to School at the End of Each Project Year

Appendix A

Application forms for Paraprofessional Employment

HAMMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
5935 Hohman Avenue
Hammond, Indiana
Tel.1-219-932-5700
46320

52

APPLICATION FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

PERSONNEL DATA

Name Dr.,Mr. Mrs.,Miss _____
Last First Middle Initial/Maiden Name

Address _____ Telephone _____
Street City State

Place of Birth _____ Date of Birth _____ Ht. _____ Wt. _____

Marital Status _____ Number/Ages of Children _____

Present Occupation _____ Salary _____

Social Security Number _____/_____/_____ .

EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION (List in chronological order)

School	Address	Dates Attended	Date Graduated	Length of Course

Special training which would be helpful to you in this work: _____

Positions of leadership held in school and community: _____

Activities in which you have participated: _____

WORK EXPERIENCE

Firm or Organization	Address	Dates	Type of Work

REFERENCES (List four who know you and your work best.)

Name	Official Position	Address

We are interested in any further information about you which may distinguish your application, or why you are interested in this program. (Use reverse side.)

Appendix B

Interview form for Paraprofessional Employment

PARAPROFESSIONAL INTERVIEW FORM

H.P.S
6-29-67

Candidate Interviewed Miss / Mrs. / Mr. _____ Last _____ First _____ Date _____

Candidates Home Address _____ Phone _____

Amount of Education _____ H.S. _____ College _____ College Grad.

Checklist

	Above Average	Average	Below Average
Personal Appearance			
Taste appropriateness in dress			
Use of English			
Voice Effectiveness			
Mental Alertness			
Enthusiasm & Vitality. . . .			

Experiences of Value to this Program

School Activities _____

_____

Community Activities _____

_____

Extracurricular Activities _____

_____

General Remarks Concerning Candidate: (Additional beneficial experiences): _____

_____

Concerning the Interview

_____ The candidate was not seriously interested.

_____ The candidate was only mildly interested.

_____ The candidate was extremely interested.

Do you think this candidate would be of value in the paraprofessional program? _____

Recommendation

_____Highly favorable _____ Favorable

_____Not Distinctive _____ Unfavorable

_____
Interviewer

Appendix C

Teachers' Referral Forms to Corrective Reading Program

REFERRAL FORM FOR SUMMER CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - 1970

Name _____ Referral Date _____
(First) (Last)

Birthdate _____ Age _____ Sex _____

School _____ Teacher _____ Room No. _____

Standardized Reading Test Scores:

Date	Name of Test	Norm	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Average Reading
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Mental Abilities Test: Date _____ Name of Test _____ IQ _____

Your estimate of the child's independent reading level PP P 1 2 3 4 5 6
(This is the level where the child can read without help, generally with 95-99% accurate pronunciation and good phrasing.)

Your estimate of the child' frustration reading level PP P 1 2 3 4 5 6
(This is where reading is slow or word-by-word and with numerous errors.)

Has this child been enrolled in a previous remedial reading program? _____
(When _____ Where _____ Teacher's recommendation _____

How would you rate this pupil's intellectua. potential?
1) Above average 2) Average 3) Below average

How would you rate this pupil's emotional adjustment with respect to your present class?
1) Among the best 2) Among the average 3) Among the poorest

This pupil gets into fights or quarrels with other pupils _____
1) Seldom or never 2) Not very often 3) Quite often 4) Most of the time

Please comment regarding the child's major problem in reading:

Basis for Referral:

A. _____ Test data
B. _____ Recommendation of corrective reading teacher
C. _____ Teacher judgment and present performance in reading. (Please explain.) Use back of page if necessary.

Appendix D

Parent Letter

School City of Hammond, Indiana

Telephone 219-932-5700

5935 Hohman Avenue
HAMMOND, INDIANA 46320

September 15, 1970

Dear

Your child _____ has been identified as one who will benefit from individualized instruction in reading. He will participate in a corrective reading program during the school year 1969-1970, forty-five minutes per day, five days per week.

During the first six weeks of the school year, a complete analysis of your child's reading skills will be made and a report of his reading problems will be sent to you October 31, 1969. Three more reports of progress will be sent to you at the conclusion of subsequent grading periods indicating: growth in skill areas, evaluation of progress, and suggestions for improvement.

Parent conferences are encouraged and will be held at your request or that of your child's reading teacher. It is felt that the conferences will not be necessary until the conclusion of the analysis of reading skills.

If you desire further information regarding this program, please contact me at 932-5700, ext. 50 or 57.

Yours truly,

Eleanor P. Dragus, Director
Para-professional Corrective Reading Program

EPD:k

Appendix E

Job Description - Paraprofessional Reading Technicians

JOB DESCRIPTION

Paraprofessional Reading Technicians

The paraprofessional reading technician at the middle school level will have generalized knowledge in the following areas:

Child Development and Psychology

Middle School Curriculum (Academic & Extra-curricular)

The paraprofessional reading technician will have specialized knowledge in the following areas:

Sequential Reading Skill Development

Motivation of Underachievers

Methods and Techniques of Corrective Reading Instruction

Diagnostic Measures of Reading Disabilities

Materials and Machines employed in Developing Reading Skills

The paraprofessional reading technician will provide reading instruction to specially selected remedial pupils in the following areas:

Structural Analysis

Vocabulary Development

Phonetic Analysis

Sight Vocabulary

Comprehension

The paraprofessional reading technician will be directly responsible to the professional reading teacher who has charge of

the diagnosis, instruction, and evaluation of all pupils in the corrective reading program in the assigned building.

Appendix F

Job Description - Reading Supervisors

JOB DESCRIPTION

SUPERVISORS OF PARAPROFESSIONAL READING TECHNICIANS

The supervisors of paraprofessional reading technicians will be certificated reading teachers assigned to the corrective reading department. Each of the supervising teachers will have as his responsibilities:

I. Administration and interpretation of diagnositc reading skill instruments

II. Preparation of the reports of reading skill disabilities

III. Selection and scheduling of pupils for individualized programs of reading

IV. Prescription of instruction and selection of materials to correct skill disabilities of each pupil

V. Supervision of paraprofessional instruction through observation and conferences

VI. Evaluation of paraprofessional performance

VII. Supervision of reporting procedures to parents, school and the reading center

VIII. Coordination of the paraprofessional reading program with the school city program

IX. Participation in parent/paraprofessional conferences

X. Compilation of data pertinent to the experimental project.

Appendix G

Pre-Service Workshop

PRE-SERVICE WORKSHOP

FOR

PARA-PROFESSIONALS

HAMMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SUMMER-1967

Workshop for Para-Professional and Language Arts Teachers

1st Week (7-10-67)
Monday

1:15 P.M. - Introduction - Mr. Tom Buran

1:30 P.M. - Workshop Plan - Mrs. Eleanor McKenna

2:15 P.M. - Break

2:30 P.M. - Discussion:
"The Need for Para-professional and Teachers"

Mr. Wm. Preston — Mrs. Eleanor McKenna
Mr. Wm. Lutton — Mrs. Margie Keltner

Tuesday

1:15 P.M. - Movie
"When I'm Old Enough, Goodbye"

1:45 P.M. - Speaker - Mr. E. Nelson
"Results of Hammond Drop-Out Study--Causes"

2:15 P.M. - Break

2:30 P.M. - Discussion:
"The Drop-Out Problem--Solution"
Mr. E. Nelson, Discussion Leader

Wednesday

1:15 P.M. - Speaker - Miss Rowena Piety
"Tutoring --A Guideline for Success"

2:15 P.M. - Break

2:30 P.M. - Discussion
Miss Rowena Piety
Miss Rose Trachenberg

Thursday

1:15 P.M. - Speaker - Mr. Tom Buran
"Attitudes Necessary in Dealing with Under-achieving Adolescents"

2:15 P.M. - Break

2:30 P.M. - Discussion
Mr. Tom Buran, Discussion Leader

Friday

1:15 P.M. - Principals, Language Arts and Reading teachers to meet with Mrs. Walker

1:15 P.M. - Para-Professionals -- Movie
"Not by Chance"

1:45 P.M. - Para-Professionals -- Discussion
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Discussion Leader

2:30 P.M. - Language Arts and Reading Teachers to meet with Mrs. Walker

2:30 P.M. - Discussion:
"Workshop" for the Following Week"
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Discussion Leader

2nd week (7-17-67)

Monday

8:30-11:30 A.M. - Discussion:
"Reading for Pleasure"
Mrs. Margaret Walker, Discussion Leader
Board of Education (Letters "A" - "H")

8:30-11:30 A.M. - Demonstration:
"The Use of A.V. Materials"
Mr. Wm. Lutton, Instructor,
Wilson School (Letters "J" - "Z")

1:15-3:30 P.M. - Demonstration:
"The Use of Reading Machines"
Mr. Marvin Wheeler, Instructor

Tuesday

8:30-11:30 A.M. - Discussion:
"Reading for Pleasure"
Mrs. Margaret Walker, Board of Education
(Letters "J" - "Z")

8:30-11:30 A.M. - Demonstration:
"The Use of A.V. Materials"
Mr. Wm. Lutton, Instructor,
Wilson School (Letters "A" - "H")

1:15 P.M. - Discussion:
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Discussion Leader

2:30 P.M. - Discussion:
"Establishing Rapport with Pupils"
Discussion Leaders - Mrs. Margie Keltner
Mr. Marvin Wheeler

Wednesday

8:30-11:30 A.M.- Discussion:
Mr. Wm. Lutton, Instructor,
Wilson School

1:15 P.M. - Speaker - Mr. Wm. Preston
"Teacher Ethics"

2:15 P.M. - Break

2:30 P.M. - Discussion:
"Establishing Rapport with Teachers and Staff"
Sister Clarotta
Mrs. Mary Concialdi
Mrs. Margie Keltner

Thursday

8:30-11:30 A.M.- Observation schedule to be announced Wednesday A.M.

1:15 P.M. - Discussion of A.M. Observation
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna

2:15 P.M. - Discussion:
"Establishing Rapport with Parents"
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna

Friday

8:30-11:30 A.M.- Observation schedule to be announced Wednesday A.M.

1:15 P.M. - Discussion of A.M.
Observation, Mrs. Eleanor McKenna

2:15 P.M. - Break

2:30 P.M. - Speaker - Mrs. Eleanor McKenna
"Reading Terminology"

3rd Week (7-24-67)

- All Paraprofessionals will work in Reading Centers during the morning of this week.

Monday

1:15 P.M. - Sequential Reading Skills
(K-6) Mrs. Marie Kupris, Speaker

Tuesday

1:15 P.M. - Sequential Reading Skills
(7-8) Juanita Jones, Speaker

2:30 P.M. - Word Recognition
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Consultant

Wednesday

1:15 P.M. - Consonant Sounds (Single)
(Initial, Medial, Final)
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Consultant

2:30 P.M. - Consonant Sounds
(Initial, Medial, Final)
a. Speech Consonants
b. Consonant Blends
Mr. Serge Wilk, Consultant

Thursday

1:15 P.M. - Vowel Sounds
1. Long
2. Short
3. Diphthongs
4. Miscellaneous (Rules)
Mr. Mike Scianni, Consultant

Friday

1:15 P.M. - Silent Letters
Consonants with 2 sounds
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Consultant

4th Week (7-31-67)

Monday

1:15 P.M. - Affixes
1. Inflectional Endings
2. Prefixes
3. Suffixes
Juanita Jones, Consultant

2:30 P.M. - Syllable Divisions
Juanita Jones, Consultant

Tuesday

1:15 P.M. - Context Clues
Mr. Bill Lutton, Consultant

2:30 P.M. - Use of the Dictionary
Mr. Bill Lutton, Consultant

Wednesday

1:15 P.M. - Vocabulary Development
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Consultant

2:30 P.M. - Three Types of Comprehension
Mr. Mike Scianni, Consultant

Thursday

1:15 P.M. - Sequential Skills in Comprehension
Mr. Serge Wilk, Consultant

Friday

1:15 P.M. - Common Errors and Suggestions for Remediation
Comprehension in Content Areas
Mrs. Eleanor McKenna, Consultant

2:30 P.M. - Evaluation of Workshop by Para-Professionals

Appendix H

Disability Diagnosis

H.P.S.
REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM

Pupil's Name_____
Teacher's Name_____
Date(s)_____

Adapted from Kottemeyer's Teacher's Guide for Remedial Reading

Disability Diagnosis

1. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test

2. Use of context clues

3. Names of letters

4. Consonant sounds

5. Ability to substitute beginning consonant sounds

6. Ability to hear short vowel sounds

7. Two common long vowel word patterns

8. Knowledge of common vowel digraphs

9. Ability to blend letter sounds

10. Reversals

11. Ability to see prefixes as units

12. Ability to see common suffixes as sunits

13. Ability to see compound suffixes as units

14. Ability to divide long words into parts

2. Use of Context Clues

"Dick,"_____Mother, " will you go to the store for me?"

"Surely,_____," said _____. "What shall I get?"

"I need a _____of butter, a loaf of _____, and a _____ eggs," said _____. "Hurry!"

_____ ran to the sore and was soon back.

"That's a good _____," said _____.

"Thank _____ very much."

"You're welcome, Mother," said _____, and he ran off to _____ ball with his _____.

3. Names of Letters

B A I S C C F E P T M L R

Z J U H G W X Q K V Y N O

r o n l m y t b k p z i a

j u s b h c g w d f x g e

5. Substitution of Beginning Consonants

man sent star night at hen blue kite hair nest

ban pent mar bright gat fan clue rite lair zest

7. Vowel Patterns

Teal vie shoal trite gate dune

8. Common Vowel Digraphs

nook awl coy flout stray maul foil jowl

9. Blending Letter Sounds

fis lote gud keat hin sut jau

tope sive muts bame grue nibs pud

nobe beed nel bute kin sult faim

4. Beginning Consonant Sounds

1. savory
2. homogenous
3. vagrancy
4. bureaucrat
5. cummerbund
6. genealogy
7. lateral
8. distortion
9. jovial
10. winsome
11. martyr
12. pugilist
13. neuritis
14. fabulous
15. rational
16. turbulent
17. kerosene

Beginning Consonant Blends

1. creditor
2. blandish
3. whimper
4. drastic
5. plutocrat
6. thyroid
7. shimmer
8. cherub
9. fluency
10. triumphant
11. stoic
12. slogan
13. granule
14. cheetah
15. whimsical

6. Short Vowel Sounds - Auditory Discrimination (Medial)

1.	aptitude	6.	effervescent	a.	bread
2.	eccentric	7.	unctuous	b.	bunk
3.	antagonize	8.	ominous	c.	snap
4.	illicit	9.	imminent	d.	split
5.	optomistic	10.	ulterior	e.	black

Disability Diagnosis

10. Reversals

pal even no saw raw ten tar won pot

11. Prefixes

repan conjump inwell delike dispay combent

ungate exfry proread enstand prehead

12. Suffixes

balling booker florest daytion skinance

meatness chairly waterful burnant truckous

13. Compounds

nightbank dinnerplayer basketmeat broomfeather

paperjumper eatmobile spaderoom carthouse

14. Syllables

bombardment combination

refreshment establishment

revolver entertain

calculate cucamber

Appendix I

Evaluation Form - Teachers

EVALUATION OF PARAPROFESSIONAL
READING PROGRAM

Please fill out the following questionaire and return it to the Paraprofessional teachers' mailbox by January 26, 1968. As this is a new program we are hoping to make improvements on the basis of your comments, so please make them as concrete as possible.

1. To what extent do you feel this program was of benefit to the pupils you have in class?

2. In what respect did this program assist you as a classroom teacher?

3. If you observed any attitude change of any pupils in the program, please list the pupil by name and specify the type of change. (eg. John Doe - gained self-confidence)

4. Were you able to discern carry-over of reading skills from the remedial reading classes to your own class or to other subject areas? (Specify)

5. In your opinion, how did the pupils feel about the reading program?

6. What suggestions would you make for changes in the program for next semester?

7. Additional Comments:

Name _____

School _____

Subject _____

Appendix J

Evaluation Forms - Paraprofessionals

H.P.S.
8-4-67

Evaluation of Paraprofessional Training Program

1. To what degree do you feel the training program has been successful in preparing you for participation in the Paraprofessional Teacher Program?

2. To what extent did the training program meet your expectations?

3. What parts of the instructional program did you find to be most:

   a. informative?

   b. interesting?

   c. effective?

4. How did your experiences in the reading centers help to prepare you for your duties in the Paraprofessional Program?

5. To what extent did the training program fail to meet your expectations?

6. In which specific areas of reading do you feel you need more explanation, information, and discussion?

7. What suggestions do you have for future in-service intruction? (Please be specific)

Appendix K

Evaluation Form - Parents

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM
HAMMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MARCH 6, 1968

Child's Name _____ Date _____

Your child is doing special work in reading at _____ School this semester/year. We are most interested in the student's progress in reading at home. We would appreciate your comments concerning the program.

Recreational Reading

1. Is the child reading any books from school at home? _____
2. Does the child have any difficulty in reading the books? _____

   What kind of difficulty? _____
3. Does the child read any other type of material at home? _____

   What kind of material? _____
4. Does he have any difficulty in reading this material? _____

   What kind of difficulty? _____
5. How does all reading at home compare with reading before the

   program? _____

Reading Skills and Attitudes

Have you seen progress in: (Check one for each part)

	Much Progress	Some Progress	No Progress
1. Attacking new words	_____	_____	_____
2. Understanding what he reads	_____	_____	_____
3. Confidence in reading	_____	_____	_____
4. Level of material he is able to read	_____	_____	_____
5. Interest in reading	_____	_____	_____
6. Attitude toward reading	_____	_____	_____

Do you believe that the program is proving to be helpful to your child in the improvement of reading? Much Help ____ Some Help _____

No Help _____

PARENT'S SIGNATURE _____

Appendix L

Parent Workshop

H.P.S.
1/23/68

WORKSHOP FOR PARENTS

Your child has been or will be participating in one of the Hammond Public Schools Corrective Reading Programs. Many of you have indicated in parent-teacher conferences that you would like suggestions regarding aid you could give your child at home to help him improve his reading skills. We have planned an evening seminar around many of the questions you have asked.

January 31, 1968 7:30 - 9:30 P.M.
Edison School Auditorium
7025 Madison Avenue
Hammond, Indiana

The program for the evening is as follows:

7:30 - Introductions

7:45 - "How to Cope with Corrective Reading Problems"
Mr. Lawrence Moburg,
Director of Reading
Michigan City Public Schools

8:30 - Discussion Groups
These groups will be led by specialists in the areas of education and reading who will attempt to answer your questions regarding:

Motivation of Pleasure Reading

Techniques and Methods which parents can use to help improve reading skills.

Informal learning activities

Developing a positive attitude toward learning

We hope you can attend this workshop. In order for us to plan adequately for the number of participants, please fill in the following information and have your child return it to his corrective reading teacher by Monday, January 29, 1968.

- -

( ) I will attend the workshop (Indicate number of persons attending)

( ) I cannot attend the workshop.

( ) I cannot attend this workshop, but I would be interested in participating in one at a later date.

Parent's Name _____
Child's Name _____
School _____

Appendix M

Directed Reading Lesson

NORTHWEST MULTI-SERVICE EDUCATIONAL CENTER
P.O. Box 295, Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
Dial 219 - 462-8580

DIRECTED READING LESSON

I. Teacher Planning

A. Plan lesson in terms of how it fits in with subject or unit under discussion.

B. Preread the material to determine what concepts and vocabulary the material develops.

C. Determine what skills and/or concepts should be taught.

D. Organize and collect supplementary aids and materials needed.

II. Readiness

A. Determine readiness for the subject.

B. Develop or extend background of information needed for understanding subject.

C. Determine and/or familiarize students with vocabulary or material.

D. Set purposes (student and teacher) for lesson.

III. Guided Silent Reading

A. Have students engage in activity either as a group, small sub group or independently depending on material and instructional needs.

B. Instill the reasons for reading silently before oral reading and rereading and for avoiding "sounding out" words.

C. Develop awareness of frustrational symptoms.

D. Discuss variety of ways of evaluating material read.

IV. Oral Rereading

A. Establish reasons for oral reading following silent reading.

B. Extend or acquaint group with methods of doing oral rereading as opposed to usual "round-robin" techniques.

V. Skill Development and Follow-up

A. Establish difference between developing a skill and reinforcing it as an independent activity.

B. Appraise understanding of group.

C. Acquaint or develop ways of teaching specific skills.

D. Explain and develop ways of correlating material with practical situations and/or other subjects being studied.

Appendix N

Progress Reports

Para-professional Title III
Corrective Reading Program
Mrs. Eleanor P. Dragus, Director

Hammond Public Schools
Dr. Robert L. Medcalf, Supt.
Date_____

EVALUATION REPORT

Name_____ School_____Grade___H.R.___

Name of Parents or Guardian _____

Address_____

This report indicates the progress your child has made in corrective reading.

_____

_____

Attitude and Behavior:

Interest in terms of current reading instruction and pleasure readings:

_____

_____

Following is a list of skill areas in which _____ is receiving individual instruction. Specific areas of weakness are indicated by an (X).

_____

I. Vocabulary

Sight Vocabulary	_____	Vowel Sounds	_____
Sight Phrases	_____	Prefixes	_____
Consonant Blends	_____	Suffixes	_____
Consonant Sounds	_____	Dictionary Skills	_____

_____

_____

II. Comprehension

Factual	_____	Sequence of Events	_____
Main Ideas	_____	Drawing Conclusions	_____
Details	_____	Making Comparisons	_____
		Cause and Effect	_____

Comments:

_____

_____

III. Oral Reading

Interpretation	_____	Pronunciation	_____
Comprehension	_____	Phrasing	_____
Fluency	_____	Expression	_____
Enunciation	_____		

Comments:

Test Scores

The pretest score indicates in grade equivelents (4.5 = fourth grade - fifth month) the reading level of the child at the time he entered the program. Retest scores will be communicated when the pupil is dropped from the program or at the end of the school year. Please note that oral reading test scores are ordinarily lower than silent reading comprehension scores.

Silent Reading Comprehension	Oral Reading
Pretest_____Retest_____	Pretest_____Retest_____
Growth_____	Growth_____

Recommendations:

Para-professional_____

Reading Specialist _____

_____

Appendix O

Materials

PARAPROFESSIONAL TITLE III

REVISED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL ORDER

Benefic Press	$186.00
Bobbs Merrill	152.00
Bureau of Publications	45.00
Garrard Publishing Co.	493.63
Ginn & Company	67.50
Globe Book Company	56.00
Harcourt-Brace	36.75
Harr Wagner Publishing	195.00
D. C. Heath	105.12
J. B. Lippincott	69.00
Milton-Bradley	82.00
Reader's Digest	31.00
Scott-Foresman	69.75
Webster-McGraw Hill	740.00
TOTAL	$2329.25

BENEFIC PRESS

WORLD OF ADVENTURE SERIES

10	Flight to the North Pole	$2.00 ea	$20.00
10	Lost Uranium Mine	"	20.00
10	Hunting Grizzly Bears	"	20.00
10	Fire on the Mountains	"	20.00
10	City Beneath the Sea	"	20.00
10	Sacred Will of Sacrifice	"	20.00
10	The Search for Piranha	"	20.00
10	Viking Treasure	"	20.00
5	Teachers Guide for Series (1a)	1.20	6.00
25	Pupils Activity Book	.80	20.00
		TOTAL	$186.00

BOBBS MERRILL

Childhood of Famous American Series

5	Abe Lincoln: Frontier Boy	$2.20 ea	$11.00
5	Albert Einstein: Young Thinker	2.20	11.00
5	Alec Hamilton: The Little Lion	"	11.00
5	Ben Franklin: Boy Printer	"	11.00
5	Booker T. Washington: Ambitious Boy	"	11.00
5	Brigham Young: Covered Wagon Boy	"	11.00
5	Ethel Barrymore: Girl Actress	"	11.00
5	Eleanor Roosevelt: Courageous Girl	"	11.00
5	Sacagawea	"	11.00
5	Pocahontas	"	11.00

5	Manuals Gray Orals	.50	2.50
25	Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs(Revised) 12 Form A, 13 Form B	1.60	40.00
		TOTAL	$152.50

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS

McCall-Crabbs Standard Test Lessons

25	Level A	$ .45 ea.	11.25
25	Level B	"	11.25
25	Level C	"	11.25
25	Level D	"	11.25
		TOTAL	$45.00

GARRARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

Folklore of the World Books

5	Stories from Canada	$2.49	$12.45
5	Stories from Alaska	"	12.45
5	Stories from France	"	12.45
5	Stories from Old China	"	12.45
5	Stories from Old Egypt	"	12.45
5	Stories from Old Russia	"	12.45
5	Stories from Hawaii	"	12.45
5	Stories from India	"	12.45
5	Stories from Italy	"	12.45
5	Stories from Japan	"	12.45
5	Stories from Mexico	"	12.45
5	Stories from Spain	"	12.45

Pleasure Reading Books			
5	Aesop's Fables	$2.27	$11.35
5	Anderson Stories	"	11.35
5	Bible Stories	"	11.35
5	Fairy Stories	"	11.35
5	Famous Stories	"	11.35
5	Far East Stories	"	11.35
5	Gospel Stories	"	11.35
5	Greek Stories	"	11.35
5	Gulliver's Stories	"	11.35
5	Ivanhoe	"	11.35
5	Old World Stories	"	11.35
5	Robinhood Stories	"	11.35
5	Robinson Crusoe	"	11.35
Rivers of The World Books			
4	The Amazon	$2.19	8.76
4	The Chagres	"	8.76
4	The Colorado	"	8.76
4	The Columbia	"	8.76
4	The Congo	"	8.76
4	The Hudson	"	8.76
4	The Jordan	"	8.76
4	The Mississippi	"	8.76
4	The Nile	"	8.76
4	The Rhine	"	8.76

4	The Rimas	$ 2.19	$ 8.76
4	The Rio Grande	"	8.76
4	The St. Lawrence	"	8.76
4	The Seine	"	8.76
4	The Shannon	"	8.76
4	The Susquehanna	"	8.76
4	The Thames	"	8.76
4	The Yangtze	"	8.76
5	Group Sounding Game	2.10	10.50
5	The Syllable Game	"	10.50
5	Take	1.50	7.50
5	Basic Sight Cards (Words)	1.10	5.50
5	Basic Sight Cards (Phrase)	1.00	5.00
		TOTAL	$493.63

GINN & COMPANY

5	Word Analysis Charts(set of 20)	$13.50 ea	$67.50
		TOTAL	$67.50

GLOBE BOOK COMPANY

5	Stories for Teen Agers Bk A	$2.80	$14.00
5	Stories for Teen Agers Bk 1	"	14.00
5	Stories for Teen Agers Bk 2	"	14.00
5	Stories for Today's Youth Bk 1	"	14.00
		TOTAL	$56.00

HARCOURT-BRACE

Practice Analysis Cards

5	Set A	$2.45	$12.25

5	Set B	$2.45	$12.45
5	Set C	"	12.45
		TOTAL	$36.75

HARR WAGNER PUBLISHING CO.

Morgan Bay Mysteries

5	The Mystery of Morgan Castle	$2.20	$11.00
5	The Mystery of the Marble Angel	"	11.00
5	The Mystery of the Midnight Visitor	"	11.00
5	The Mystery of the Missing Marlin	"	11.00
5	The Mystery of the Musical Ghost	2.40	12.00
5	The Mystery of Monks Island	"	12.00
5	The Mystery of Marauder's Gold	"	12.00
5	The Mystery of the Myrmidon's Journey	"	12.00
5	Teacher's Manuals for Morgan Bay Mysteries	1.00	5.00

The Reading Motivated Series

5	Desert Treasure	2.80	14.00
5	The Mysterious Swamp Rider	"	14.00
5	The Secret of Lonesome Valley	"	14.00

The Deep-Sea Adventure Series

3	The Sea Hunt	2.00	6.00
3	Treasure Under the Sea	"	6.00
3	Submarine Rescue	"	6.00
3	The Pearl Divers	2.20	6.60
3	Frogmen in Action	"	6.60

3	Danger Below	$2.20	$ 6.60
3	Whale Hunt	"	6.60
3	Rocket Divers	"	6.60
5	Teacher's Manuals for The Deep Sea Adventure Series	1.00	5.00
		TOTAL	$195.00

D. C. HEATH

Teen-Age Tales

3	Book A (2nd Edition)	$ 3.28	9.76
3	Book A Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed.)	.64	1.92
3	Book B (2nd Ed.)	3.28	9.76
3	Book B Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed)	.64	1.92
3	Book C (2nd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book C Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed)	.64	1.92
3	Book 1 (3rd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book 1 Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed)	.64	1.92
3	Book 2 (3rd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book 2 Teacher's Manual (3rd Ed)	.64	1.92
3	Book 3 (2nd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book 3 Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed)	.64	1.92
3	Book 4 (2nd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book 4 Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed)	.64	1.92
3	Book 5 (2nd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book 5 Teacher's Manual (2nd)	.64	1.92
3	Book 6 (2nd Ed)	3.28	9.76
3	Book 6 Teacher's Manual (2nd Ed)	.64	1.76
		TOTAL	$105.12

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

5	Reading for Meaning Teacher's Guides, Bks 5,6,7	$ .60	$ 3.00
25	Reading for Meaning Book 5	.88	22.00
25	Reading for Meaning Book 6	.88	22.00
25	Reading for Meaning Book 7	.88	22.00
		TOTAL	$ 69.00

MILTON-BRADLEY COMPANY

4	Tote-Easy Teaching Rack #7903	18.00	72.00
5	Phonetic Quizzme	2.00	10.00
		TOTAL	$82.00

READERS' DIGEST SERVICES INC.

10	Teachers' Manuals for Adult Readers	$ .10	$ 1.00
10	Workers in the Sky	.25	2.50
10	Send for Red	.25	2.50
10	Mystery of the Mountains	"	2.50
10	Second Chance	"	2.50
10	A Race to Remember	"	2.50
10	Valley of 10,000 Smokes	"	2.50
10	Santa Fe Traders	"	2.50
10	Men Who Dare the Sea	"	2.50
10	Guides to High Adventure	"	2.50
	Adult Readers		
10	First at the Finish	"	2.50
10	I Fell 18,000 Feet	"	2.50
10	What's on the Moon	"	2.50
		TOTAL	$31.00

SCOTT FORESMAN

25	Thorndike Barnhart Dictionary	$ 2.79	$ 69.75
		TOTAL	$ 69.75

WEBSTER DIVISION

10	Classroom Reading Clinic	74.00	740.00
		TOTAL	$740.00

Appendix P

Sample of Report Sent to School at the End of Each Project Year

AVERAGE GROWTH BY GRADE LEVEL
First Semester 1968-1969

School	Grade	Male	Female	Total	Average Growth Gray Oral	Average Growth Stanford Silent
Edison	6	9	5	14	+0.4	+0.7
Gavit	6	---	---	---	---	---
Lafayette	6	---	---	---	---	---
Morton Middle	6	3	1	4	+0.3	+1.0
O.L.P.H.	6	4	10	14	+1.2	+1.0
Spohn	6	6	4	10	+1.0	+1.1
Washington	6	---	---	---	---	---
Edison	7	2	3	5	+0.3	+0.4
Gavit	7	6	10	16	+0.4	+0.6
Lafayette	7	4	1	5	+1.2	+0.7
Morton Middle	7	14	4	18	-0.3	+1.0
O.L.P.H.	7	4	2	6	+1.2	+0.9
Spohn	7	11	12	23	+0.7	+0.8
Washington	7	3	2	5	+0.6	+1.0
Edison	8	13	7	20	+0.1	+1.0
Gavit	8	16	4	20	+0.9	+0.1
Lafayette	8	2	3	5	+2.2	+1.4
Morton Middle	8	6	10	16	+0.6	+0.9
O.L.P.H.	8	---	---	---	---	---
Spohn	8	3	5	8	+1.0	+1.1
Washington	8	5	---	5	+0.5	+1.6

School	Grade	Male	Female	Total	Average Growth Gray Oral	Average Growth Stanford Silent
Total	6	22	20	42	+0.8	+0.9
Total	7	44	34	78	+0.5	+0.8
Total	8	45	29	74	+0.7	+0.8
	Total	111	83	194	+0.6	+0.8

AVERAGE GROWTH BY SCHOOL

Edison	Total	24	15	39	+0.3	+0.8
Gavit	Total	22	14	36	+0.7	+0.3
Lafayette	Total	6	4	10	+1.7	+1.1
Morton Middle	Total	23	15	38	+0.2	+1.0
O.L.P.H.	Total	8	12	20	+1.2	+1.0
Spohn	Total	20	21	41	+0.8	+0.9
Washington	Total	8	2	10	+0.6	+1.2
Total				194	+0.6	+0.8